

CALIFORNIA BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

By CHARLES B. PINKHAM, M. D.
Secretary of the Board

On October 27, 1930, Governor C. C. Young announced the following appointments on the Board of Medical Examiners:

Clark L. Abbott, M. D., Oakland, vice self, for a term expiring August 10, 1934.

William H. Geistweit, Jr., M. D., San Diego, vice self, for a term expiring August 10, 1934.

H. Miller Robertson, M. D., Santa Ana, vice James L. Maupin, M. D., deceased, for a term expiring August 10, 1931.

C. E. Schoff, M. D., Sacramento, vice self, term expiring August 10, 1934.

At the annual meeting of the Board of Medical Examiners held in Sacramento, October 20 to 24, inclusive, 1930, the following officers were reelected for the ensuing year: P. T. Phillips, M. D., president; William R. Molony, M. D., vice-president; Charles B. Pinkham, M. D., secretary-treasurer.

The legal calendar comprised citations of twenty-three licentiates called before the Board for various offenses under Section 14 of the Medical Practice Act and final action was taken as follows:

Archibald A. Atkinson, M. D., Sacramento (narcotic violation), revoked October 22, 1930.

George H. Bland, M. D., Fresno (narcotic violation), was on October 21, 1930, placed on probation for a period of five years, during which time he is not to apply for a federal narcotic permit or have narcotics in his possession.

James Terrell Brown, M. D., Los Angeles, revoked October 22, 1930, for violating terms of his probation.

Samuel D. Cotterell, M. D., Los Angeles, was on October 22, 1930, revoked, based on narcotic charges.

Clarence E. Edwards, M. D., San Francisco, was on October 21, 1930, revoked, based on alleged illegal operation.

Walter C. Hoyt, M. D., Gridley, was on October 22, 1930, revoked, based on evidence of habitual intemperance.

Dwight D. Johnson, M. D., Grass Valley, was on October 22, 1930, placed on probation for a period of three years, during which time he is not to apply for or have a federal narcotic permit or have narcotics in his possession.

John R. Leadsworth, M. D., Los Angeles, was on October 21, 1930, suspended from practice for a period of one year for aiding and abetting an unlicensed practitioner. This charge was based upon the allegation that Doctor Leadsworth had purchased the California state rights for the use of a machine called "Tricho," assertedly operating on the x-ray principle, which was leased to various beauty parlors and by them used for the removal of superfluous hair, causing permanent disfigurement, according to complaints filed in the office of the Board. ("News Items," June, 1930.)

Robert H. McLauchlan, M. D., Santa Cruz, was on October 22, 1930, suspended from practice for a period of one year for aiding and abetting an unlicensed practitioner.

James J. Murray, M. D., Los Angeles (narcotic violation) was on October 21, 1930, placed on probation for a period of five years, during which time he was not to have or apply for a federal alcohol or narcotic permit or have either in his possession.

Ernest Scosseria, M. D., San Francisco (narcotic violation), was on October 21, 1930, revoked.

Newton B. Siler, M. D., Los Angeles, who on February 2, 1927, was placed on probation for five years without alcohol or narcotics, was on October 22, 1930,

found guilty of violation of the terms of his probation and his license revoked.

Fred H. Van Tassell, M. D., Berkeley (narcotic conviction), was on October 21, 1930, suspended from practice for a period of one year.

William V. Whitmore, M. D., formerly of Los Angeles, more recently Tucson, Arizona, was on October 23, 1930, revoked, based upon federal conviction of violation of the Harrison Narcotic Act, followed by incarceration at McNeil's Island Penitentiary.

Thomas O. Greig, M. D., Berkeley, revoked October 24, 1929, for habitual intemperance, was the only successful applicant for restoration of license. On October 22, 1930, Doctor Greig's license was restored and he was placed on five years' probation, during which time he is not to apply for or have an alcohol permit.

The Legal Department reported the status of the following appeals from the judgment of the Board, pending in the various courts of this state:

Pearl J. Anderson, M. D., vs. Board. Board's revocation sustained by Superior Judge Goodell.

Francis J. Bold, M. D., vs. Board (Wilhite case). Board sustained by Superior Judge Leon Yankwich of Los Angeles.

Francis J. Bold, M. D., vs. Board (de la Cuesta case), now under submission in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County.

Oscar W. de Vaughn (Oakland) vs. Board, now under submission before Superior Judge Fitzpatrick of San Francisco.

Roy S. Lanterman vs. Board. Briefs filed and submitted to Los Angeles Superior Court.

Frank M. Moran vs. Board. Superior Court sustained the Board. No notice of appeal filed.

Thomas J. Randall (Los Angeles) vs. Board. Pending decision in District Court of Appeal of Los Angeles.

Eugene Rinaldo vs. Board. (Alleged fraudulent credentials.) Revoked July 9, 1924. Board reversed July 3, 1928. Appeal pending decision in District Court of Appeal, Los Angeles.

Eugene Rinaldo vs. Board (Writ of Probation filed December 17, 1928.) Still pending final decision.

Fred B. Tapley vs. Board, Marysville; Board sustained by Superior Judge Johnson. Appeal filed October 3, 1930. Pending in District Court of Appeal.

Paul Traxler vs. Board, Los Angeles. Board sustained in Superior Court. Notice of appeal served.

* * *

NEWS ITEMS, DECEMBER, 1930

"Although a surgeon has been found not guilty on the charge of murder as the result of an illegal operation, his license may nevertheless be revoked by the Board of Medical Examiners for unprofessional and unethical conduct in performing the operation, according to a recent decision given by Superior Judge Leon R. Yankwich of Los Angeles. . . . Judge Yankwich's decision upheld the Board of Medical Examiners of California in revoking on July 30, 1930, the license of Dr. Francis James Bold of Whittier. The matter came before Judge Yankwich in the form of a petition for a writ of review directed against the Board of Medical Examiners. . . . In the petition before Judge Yankwich, the doctor's attorney claimed that the doctor was being placed twice in jeopardy and that his acquittal was a complete vindication of the charge. Judge Yankwich replied that the revocation of the license was not another punishment; but rather was aimed at the protection of society and the medical profession. He cited many cases in which two consequences, one criminal and one civil, are made to flow from one act. The rule in these cases, according to the opinion, is that acquittal on a criminal charge does not prevent exaction of the other penalty. The judge also referred to cases in which attorneys had been disbarred upon charges of which they had been previously acquitted by a jury" (*The Critic of Critics*, Los Angeles, September 30, 1930).